

Don Bivens (AZ Bar No. 005134)
Email: don@donbivens.com
Teresita T. Mercado (AZ Bar No. 020578)
Email: teresita@donbivens.com

DON BIVENS, PLLC

15169 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 205
Scottsdale, Arizona, 85254
Telephone: (602) 762-2661

SMITH KRIVOSHEY, PC

Joel D. Smith (*pro hac vice* to be filed)
867 Boylston Street, 5th Floor, Ste. 1520
Boston, MA 02116
Phone: 617-377-7404
E-Mail: joel@skclassactions.com

SMITH KRIVOSHEY, PC

Yeremey O. Krivoshey (*pro hac vice* to be filed)
166 Geary Street, Ste. 1500-1507
San Francisco, CA 94108
Phone: 415-839-7000
E-Mail: yeremey@skclassactions.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Ralph Milan, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

SFM, LLC, a Delaware limited liability
company,

Defendant.

Case No.:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff Ralph Milan (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and all others similarly
2 situated, brings this class action against Defendant SFM, LLC (“Sprouts” or
3 “Defendant”) based on Sprouts’ false and deceptive advertising and labeling of its
4 Avocado Oil Products. Plaintiff makes the following allegations based on the
5 investigation of his counsel, and on information and belief, except as to allegations
6 pertaining to Plaintiff individually, which are based on his personal knowledge.

7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 1. During the statute of limitations period, Sprouts has marketed, labeled,
9 advertised, and sold Sprouts brand Avocado Oil (the “Class Products”) to consumers.

10 2. The packaging of the Class Products unequivocally states that the oil is
11 “Avocado Oil” (the “*Avocado Oil Representation*”).

12 3. Reasonable consumers believe, based on the *Avocado Oil*
13 *Representation*, that the Class Products are pure avocado oil, meaning that the only
14 ingredient in the Class Products is avocado oil. However, unbeknownst to consumers,
15 the Class Products are adulterated with other oils.

16 4. Plaintiff seeks relief in this action individually, and on behalf of all other
17 similarly situated individuals who purchased the falsely and deceptively labeled Class
18 Products during the statute of limitations period, for violations of California’s False
19 Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, *et seq.*, California’s Unfair
20 Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*, California’s Consumers
21 Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, *et seq.*, breach of express and implied
22 warranty (Cal. Com. Code §§ 2313-2314), and intentional misrepresentation (i.e.,
23 common law fraud).

24 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

25 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the Class Action
26 Fairness Act of 2005 (“CAFA”), 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). The matter in controversy,
27 exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000, and there is
28 diversity of citizenship between some members of the proposed Classes and Sprouts.

1 Sprouts' sole member is Sprouts Farmers Markets Holdings, LLC. The sole member
2 of Sprouts Farmers Markets Holdings, LLC is Sprouts Farmers Markets, Inc., an entity
3 incorporated in Delaware with its principal place of business in Arizona.

4 6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Sprouts because Sprouts'
5 headquarters and principal place of business is located at 5455 E. High Street, Suite
6 111, Phoenix, Arizona 85054.

7 7. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1)
8 because Sprouts is a resident of Arizona.

9 **PLAINTIFF**

10 8. Plaintiff is a citizen and resident of the United States and the State of
11 California. He currently resides in Santa Ana, California.

12 9. Plaintiff purchased the Class Products while residing in California from
13 a Sprouts near his residence in Santa Ana within the past three years. Plaintiff saw and
14 relied on the *Avocado Oil Representation* in making his purchase. Plaintiff reasonably
15 believed, based on the *Avocado Oil Representation*, that he was purchasing pure
16 avocado oil, meaning that the oil contained no other ingredients besides avocado oil.
17 This belief was an important part of his decision to purchase the Class Product. Had
18 Plaintiff known that the Class Product was adulterated avocado oil, he would not have
19 purchased it, or he would have paid less for it. Thus, Plaintiff has suffered injury in
20 fact and lost money as a result of Sprouts' misleading, false, unfair, and deceptive
21 practices, as alleged herein.

22 10. Plaintiff will be unable to rely on the Class Products' *Avocado Oil*
23 *Representation* in the future, and so will be unable to purchase the Class Products in
24 the future, although he would like to. However, Plaintiff remains interested in
25 purchasing pure avocado oil products, intends on purchasing them in the future, and
26 would consider purchasing Defendant's Class Products in the future if Defendant
27 ensured that the *Avocado Oil Representation* was accurate and truthful.

11. As a result of Sprouts’ unlawful business practices, and the harm caused to Plaintiff and Class members, Sprouts should be required to pay for all damages and/or restitution. Monetary compensation alone is insufficient to remedy the ongoing harm that is being caused to Plaintiff, and Class members, who are unaware of Sprouts’ deceptive conduct and will continue purchasing the Class Products, reasonably but incorrectly believing that they are purchasing pure avocado oil. As such, injunctive relief requiring Sprouts to cease its false and deceptive labeling practices with respect to the Class Products is necessary and appropriate.

DEFENDANT

12. Sprouts is a Delaware limited liability company with its headquarters and principal place of business in Phoenix, Arizona.

13. Sprouts is a large supermarket chain that operates more than 380 stores nationwide.¹ Sprouts offers only “fresh, organic choices” and encourages customers to think of Sprouts as “all the very best parts of a real farmers market under one roof.”²

14. On its website, Sprouts provides articles and resources to customers that advertise their products. In a post entitled, “Which oil is best for cooking?” Sprouts notes that “[b]ecause avocados are difficult to process, the oil can be expensive, but the flavor and capabilities are worth the splurge.”³

15. Sprouts is directly involved in the manufacturing, sale, and distribution of Class Products, and is responsible for the advertising, marketing, trade dress, and packaging of the Class Products. Sprouts developed, marketed, and sold the Class Products during the class period.

16. Sprouts has labeled, advertised, distributed, and sold the Class Products during the statute of limitations period under its private label brand.

¹ <https://about.sprouts.com/about/>

² *Id.*

³ <https://www.sprouts.com/healthy-living/comparing-13-cooking-oils/>

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. The *Avocado Oil Representation* is False and Deceptive

17. The Class Products consist of Sprouts brand Avocado Oil. The *Avocado Oil Representation* is prominently displayed on the front label in the same manner on all Class Products, as depicted in the following representative image:



18. As seen in the above images, the *Avocado Oil Representation* conveys the unequivocal message that the Class Products are pure avocado oil and contain no other ingredients.

19. Moreover, the front label depicts several avocados halved and sliced, furthering the effect of the *Avocado Oil Representation*.

20. This message is further reinforced by the ingredient list on the Class Products' back label, which lists "avocado oil" as the only ingredient.



21. Sprouts does not disclose anywhere that the Class Products are adulterated with other oils. Thus, consumers reasonably believe the Class Products are pure avocado oil.

22. The Class Products are not pure avocado oil. Based on Plaintiff's investigation, the Class Products are not pure avocado oil and are in fact adulterated. Thus, the claim is false and misleading.

B. The *Avocado Oil Representation* is Material

23. The *Avocado Oil Representation* is material—*i.e.*, it is important to consumers with respect to their decision to purchase the Class Products.

24. Avocado oil is well-known to be one of the healthiest cooking oils. For example, studies have indicated that compounds in avocado oil may help protect the liver, lower blood pressure, LDL cholesterol, as well as reduce osteoarthritis-related joint pain, post-meal blood sugar, and total cholesterol levels.⁴ It is also high in monounsaturated fat, which is considered more heart healthy than saturated fat while being slightly more stable than the polyunsaturated fats typically found in vegetable

⁴ https://www.healthline.com/nutrition/9-avocado-oil-benefits#TOC_TITLE_HDR_4 (last visited on September 27, 2024).

1 oils.⁵ Avocado oil is also a high demand cooking oil because it has the highest smoke
2 point of all plant-based cooking oils.⁶

3 25. Regardless of whether consumers believe avocado oil is superior to other
4 oils, the issue of whether the Avocado oil is pure or is adulterated is material to
5 reasonable consumers. For example, consumers may be allergic to, or have other
6 reasons for not consuming, certain oils. Consumers of the Class Products reasonably
7 expect to know what type of oil they are consuming.

8 26. Consumers purchased, and continue to purchase, the Class Products in
9 part because the *Avocado Oil Representation* conveys the unequivocal message that it
10 is pure avocado oil. Plaintiff and Class members would have paid less for the Class
11 Products, or would not have purchased them at all, if not for the *Avocado Oil*
12 *Representation*. Therefore, Plaintiff and Class members have suffered a financial
13 injury in the form of paying a price premium that the Class Products command in the
14 market as a result of Sprouts' representations that the Class Products are pure avocado
15 oil.

16 **D. The Class Products are Not Pure Avocado Oil**

17 27. On August 27, 2024, The Washington Post reported that "adulteration is
18 rampant in the avocado oil industry, and many people are being misled by some of the
19 nation's largest retail chains."⁷

20 28. The article discussed, in detail, the findings of studies conducted by
21 scientists at the University of California at Davis ("UC Davis"). This UC Davis study
22 was published *Food Control*, an official scientific journal of the European Federation
23
24

25 ⁵ [https://www.masterclass.com/articles/what-is-avocado-oil-a-guide-to-cooking-](https://www.masterclass.com/articles/what-is-avocado-oil-a-guide-to-cooking-with-avocado-oil)
26 [with-avocado-oil](https://www.masterclass.com/articles/what-is-avocado-oil-a-guide-to-cooking-with-avocado-oil) (last visited on February 20, 2024).

⁶ *Id.*

27 ⁷ Anahad O'Connor and Aaron Steckleberg, *Why your avocado oil may be fake and*
28 *contain other cheap oils*, The Washington Post, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/wellness/2024/08/27/avocado-oil-adulteration-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/wellness/2024/08/27/avocado-oil-adulteration-tests/)
[tests/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/wellness/2024/08/27/avocado-oil-adulteration-tests/) (last visited Aug. 30, 2024).

of Food Science and Technology and the International Union of Food Science and Technology.^{8,9}

29. The study revealed that the Class Products are not pure avocado oil, but are instead adulterated with “canola oil.”¹⁰ Canola oil, which is sold by Sprouts at \$0.29/fluid ounce,¹¹ retails for significantly cheaper than the Class Products, which are sold by Sprouts at \$0.50/fluid ounce.¹²

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

30. Plaintiff brings this class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, and all other applicable laws and rules, individually, and on behalf of all members of the following Classes:

Nationwide Class

All natural persons who purchased at least one of the Class Products in the United States within the applicable statute of limitations period.

California Class

All natural persons who purchased at least one of the Class Products in the State of California within the applicable statute of limitations period.

31. Excluded from the Classes are the following individuals and/or entities: Sprouts and its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, officers and directors, current or former employees, and any entity in which Sprouts has a controlling interest; all individuals who make a timely election to be excluded from this proceeding using the correct protocol for opting out; and all judges assigned to hear any aspect of this litigation, as well as their immediate family members.

⁸ Hilary S. Green and Selina C. Wang, *First report on quality and purity evaluations of avocado oil sold in the US*, 116 Food Control 107328 (Oct. 2020).

⁹ Hilary S. Green and Selina C. Wang, *Purity and quality of private labelled avocado oil*, 152 Food Control 109837 (Oct. 2023).

¹⁰ O’Connor and Steckleberg, *Why your avocado oil may be fake*, *supra*.

¹¹ <https://shop.sprouts.com/product/27334/sprouts-organic-canola-oil>

¹² <https://shop.sprouts.com/product/64424/sprouts-avocado-oil>

1 32. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify or amend the definition of the
2 proposed Classes and/or add subclasses before the Court determines whether class
3 certification is appropriate.

4 33. Plaintiff is a member of both classes.

5 34. Numerosity: The proposed Classes are so numerous that joinder of all
6 members would be impractical. The Class Products are sold throughout the United
7 States and the State of California. The number of individuals who purchased Class
8 Product during the relevant time period is at least in the hundreds. Accordingly, Class
9 members are so numerous that their individual joinder herein is impractical. While the
10 precise number of Class members and their identities are unknown to Plaintiff at this
11 time, these Class members are identifiable and ascertainable.

12 35. Common Questions Predominate: There are questions of law and fact
13 common to the proposed Classes that will drive the resolution of this action and will
14 predominate over questions affecting only individual Class members. These questions
15 include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 16 a. Whether Sprouts misrepresented material facts and/or failed to
17 disclose material facts in connection with the packaging, marketing,
18 distribution, and sale of the Class Products;
 - 19 b. Whether Sprouts' use of the challenged packaging, i.e., the *Avocado*
20 *Oil Representation*, constituted false or deceptive advertising;
 - 21 c. Whether Sprouts engaged in unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent
22 business practices;
 - 23 d. Whether Sprouts' unlawful conduct, as alleged herein, was intentional
24 and knowing;
 - 25 e. Whether Plaintiff and the Classes are entitled to damages and/or
26 restitution, and if so, in what amount;
 - 27 f. Whether Plaintiff and the Classes are entitled to an injunctive relief;
- 28

g. Whether Plaintiff and the Classes are entitled to punitive damages, and if so, in what amount; and

h. Whether Plaintiff and the Classes are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, and costs of suit.

36. Sprouts has engaged in a common course of conduct giving rise to violations of the legal rights sought to be enforced uniformly by Plaintiff on behalf of the proposed Classes. Similar or identical statutory and common law violations, business practices, and injuries are involved. The injuries sustained by members of the proposed Classes flow, in each instance, from a common nucleus of operative fact, namely, Sprouts' deceptive packaging and advertising of the Class Products. Each instance of harm suffered by Plaintiff and Class members has directly resulted from a single course of unlawful conduct. Each Class member has been exposed to the same deceptive practice, as the packaging of Class Products: (a) bears the same material *Avocado Oil Representation*, and (b) the Class Products do not meet this representation of fact. Therefore, individual questions, if any, pale in comparison to the numerous common questions presented in this action.

37. Superiority: Because of the relatively small damages at issue for each individual Class member, no Class member could afford to seek legal redress on an individual basis. Furthermore, individualized litigation increases the delay and expense to all parties and multiplies the burden on the judicial system presented by the complex legal and factual issues of this case. Individualized litigation also presents a potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments. A class action is superior to any alternative means of prosecution.

38. Typicality: The representative Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of the proposed Classes, as all members of the proposed Classes are similarly affected by Sprouts' uniform unlawful conduct as alleged herein.

39. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the proposed Classes as his interests do not conflict with the interests of the members of

1 the proposed Classes he seeks to represent, and he has retained counsel competent and
 2 experienced in similar class action litigation. The interests of the members of the
 3 Classes will be fairly and adequately protected by the Plaintiff and his counsel.

4 40. Sprouts has also acted, or failed to act, on grounds generally applicable
 5 to Plaintiff and the proposed Classes, supporting the imposition of uniform relief to
 6 ensure compatible standards of conduct toward the members of the Classes.

7 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

8 **Violation of California's False Advertising Law** 9 **California Business & Professions Code § 17500, *et seq*** 10 **(*For all Classes*)**

11 41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges herein the allegations
 12 contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

13 42. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of
 14 the proposed Classes against Sprouts pursuant to California's False Advertising Law
 15 ("FAL"), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, *et seq*.

16 43. The FAL makes it "unlawful for any person to make or disseminate or
 17 cause to be made or disseminated before the public . . . in any advertising device . . .
 18 or in any other manner or means whatever, including over the Internet, any statement,
 19 concerning . . . personal property or services professional or otherwise, or performance
 20 or disposition thereof, which is untrue or misleading and which is known, or which by
 21 the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or misleading." Cal.
 22 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500.

23 44. Sprouts has represented and continues to represent to the public,
 24 including Plaintiff and members of the proposed Classes, through its deceptive
 25 packaging, that the Class Products are pure avocado oil. Because Sprouts has
 26 disseminated misleading information regarding the Class Products, and Sprouts
 27
 28

1 knows, knew, or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable care, that the
2 *Avocado Oil Representation* is false and misleading, Sprouts has violated the FAL.

3 45. As a result of Sprouts' false advertising, Sprouts has and continues to
4 unlawfully obtain money from Plaintiff and members of both Classes. Plaintiff
5 therefore requests that the Court cause Sprouts to restore this fraudulently obtained
6 money to his and members of the proposed Classes, to disgorge the profits Sprouts
7 made on these transactions, and to enjoin Sprouts from violating the FAL or violating
8 it in the same fashion in the future as discussed herein. Otherwise, Plaintiff and
9 members of the proposed Classes may be irreparably harmed and/or denied an
10 effective and complete remedy.

11 46. Plaintiff and members of the proposed Classes have no adequate remedy
12 at law and are therefore entitled to restitution, disgorgement, and/or the imposition of
13 a constructive trust to recover the amount of Defendant's ill-gotten gains, and/or other
14 sums as may be just and equitable.

15 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

16 **Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"),** 17 **California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*** 18 **(*For all Classes*)**

19 47. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges herein the allegations
20 contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

21 48. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of
22 the proposed Classes against Sprouts.

23 49. The UCL, Cal. Bus. & Prof Code § 17200, provides, in pertinent part,
24 that "unfair competition shall mean and include unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business
25 practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising . . .".

26 50. Under the UCL, a business act or practice is "unlawful" if it violates any
27 established state or federal law. Sprouts' false and misleading advertising of Class
28

1 Products was and continues to be “unlawful” because it violates, *inter alia*, the CLRA
2 and the FAL, as alleged herein. As a result of Sprouts’ unlawful business acts and
3 practices, Sprouts has unlawfully obtained money from Plaintiff, and members of the
4 proposed Classes.

5 51. Under the UCL, a business act or practice is “unfair” if the defendant’s
6 conduct offends an established public policy, or is immoral, unethical, oppressive,
7 unscrupulous, or substantially injurious to consumers, as the benefits for committing
8 such acts or practices are outweighed by the gravity of the harm to the alleged victims.
9 Sprouts’ conduct was and continues to be of no benefit to purchasers of the Class
10 Products, as it is misleading, unfair, unlawful, and is injurious to consumers who rely
11 on the packaging. Deceiving consumers into believing the Class Products are pure
12 avocado oil, when they are not, is of no benefit to consumers. Therefore, Sprouts’
13 conduct was and continues to be “unfair.” As a result of Sprouts’ unfair business acts
14 and practices, Sprouts has and continues to unfairly obtain money from Plaintiff, and
15 members of the proposed Classes.

16 52. Under the UCL, a business act or practice is “fraudulent” if it actually
17 deceives or is likely to deceive members of the consuming public. Sprouts’ conduct
18 was and continues to be fraudulent because it has the effect of deceiving consumers
19 into believing Class Products are pure avocado oil. Because Sprouts misled Plaintiff
20 and members of both Classes, Sprouts’ conduct was “fraudulent.” As a result of
21 Sprouts’ fraudulent business acts and practices, Sprouts has and continues to
22 fraudulently obtain money from Plaintiff and members of the proposed Classes.

23 53. Plaintiff requests that the Court cause Sprouts to restore this unlawfully,
24 unfairly, and fraudulently obtained money to her, and members of the proposed
25 Classes, to disgorge the profits Sprouts made on these transactions, and to enjoin
26 Sprouts from violating the UCL or violating it in the same fashion in the future as
27 discussed herein. Otherwise, Plaintiff and members of the proposed Classes may be
28 irreparably harmed and/or denied an effective and complete remedy.

54. Plaintiff and members of the proposed Classes have no adequate remedy at law and are therefore entitled to restitution, disgorgement, and/or the imposition of a constructive trust to recover the amount of Defendant's ill-gotten gains, and/or other sums as may be just and equitable.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act California Civil Code § 1750, *et seq.* (*For the Nationwide Class and California Class*)

55. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges herein the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

56. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed California Class against Sprouts pursuant to California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act ("CLRA"), Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, *et seq.*

57. The Class Products are a "good" within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code § 1761(a), and the purchases of the Class Product by Plaintiff and members of the California Class constitute "transactions" within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code § 1761(e).

58. Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5) prohibits "[r]epresenting that goods or services have sponsorship, approval, characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, or quantities which they do not have..." By marketing the Class Products with its current packaging, Sprouts has represented and continues to represent that the Class Products have characteristics (i.e., they are pure avocado oil) that they do not have. Therefore, Sprouts has violated section 1770(a)(5) of the CLRA.

59. Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(7) prohibits "[r]epresenting that goods or services are of a particular standard, quality, or grade, or that goods are of a particular style or model, if they are of another." By marketing the Class Products with their current packaging, Sprouts has represented and continues to represent that the Class

1 Products are of a particular standard, quality, or grade (i.e., they are pure avocado oil)
2 which they do not possess. Therefore, Sprouts has violated section 1770(a)(7) of the
3 CLRA.

4 60. Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(9) prohibits “[a]dvertising goods or services
5 with intent not to sell them as advertised.” By marketing the Class Products as pure
6 avocado oil, but not intending to sell Class Products as such (i.e., selling them with the
7 knowledge that they are adulterated), Sprouts has violated section 1770(a)(9) of the
8 CLRA.

9 61. At all relevant times, Sprouts has known or reasonably should have
10 known that its *Avocado Oil Representation* on the Class Product’s packaging is false
11 and deceptive, and that Plaintiff and other members of the California Class would
12 reasonably and justifiably rely on it when purchasing the Class Products. Nonetheless,
13 Sprouts persisted in making the *Avocado Oil Representation* on the Class Products’
14 labels to deceive consumers into believing they are buying and consuming pure
15 avocado oil.

16 62. Plaintiff and members of the California Class have justifiably relied on
17 Sprouts’ misleading *Avocado Oil Representation* when purchasing the Class Products.
18 Moreover, based on the materiality of Sprouts’ misleading and deceptive conduct,
19 reliance may be presumed or inferred for Plaintiff and members of California Class.

20 63. Plaintiff and members of the California Class have suffered and continue
21 to suffer injuries caused by Sprouts because they would have paid less for the Class
22 Products, or would not have purchased them at all, had they known that the *Avocado*
23 *Oil Representation* was false.

24 64. Accordingly, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all other members of
25 the Class, seeks to enjoin the unlawful acts and practices described herein.

26 65. On September 16, 2024, a CLRA demand letter was sent to Defendant’s
27 headquarters and registered agent. This letter provided notice of Defendant’s
28

violation of the CLRA, for Plaintiff and the class, and demanded that Defendant correct the unlawful, unfair, false and/or deceptive practices alleged here.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Breach of Express Warranty California Commercial Code § 2313 (For all Classes)

66. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges herein the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

67. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed Classes against Sprouts.

68. California's express warranty statute provides that "(a) Any affirmation of fact or promise made by the seller to the buyer which relates to the goods and becomes part of the basis of the bargain creates an express warranty that the goods shall conform to the affirmation or promise," and "(b) Any description of the goods which is made part of the basis of the bargain creates an express warranty that the goods shall conform to the description." Cal. Com. Code § 2313.

69. Sprouts has expressly warranted on the Class Products' packaging that they are pure avocado oil through the *Avocado Oil Representation*.

70. This representation about the Class Products is: (a) an affirmation of fact or promise made by Sprouts to consumers that Class Products are pure avocado oil; (b) became part of the basis of the bargain to purchase the Class Products when Plaintiff and other consumers relied on the representation; and (c) created an express warranty that the Class Products would conform to the affirmation of fact or promise. In the alternative, the representation about the Class Products is a description of goods which were made as part of the basis of the bargain to purchase the Class Products, and which created an express warranty that the Class Products would conform to the Class Products' description.

71. Plaintiff and members of the Classes reasonably and justifiably relied on the foregoing express warranties, believing that the Class Products did in fact conform to those warranties.

72. Sprouts has breached the express warranties made to Plaintiff and members of the proposed Classes by failing to produce the Class Products in accordance with the *Avocado Oil Representation*, as expressly warranted on the packaging.

73. Plaintiff and members of the proposed Classes paid a premium price for the Class Products but did not obtain the full value of the Class Products as represented. If Plaintiff and members of the proposed Classes had known of the true nature of the Class Products, they would not have been willing to pay the premium price charged in the market, or would not have purchased them at all. As a result, Plaintiff and members of the Classes suffered injury and deserve to recover all damages afforded under the law.

74. Within a reasonable amount of time after Plaintiff discovered that Sprouts did in fact breach the express warranty, Plaintiff notified Sprouts of the breach.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Breach of Implied Warranty California Commercial Code § 2314 (2)(f) (For all Classes)

75. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges herein the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

76. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed Classes against Sprouts.

77. California's implied warranty of merchantability statute provides that "a warranty that the goods shall be merchantable is implied in a contract for their sale if

1 the seller is a merchant with respect to goods of that kind.” Cal. Com.
2 Code § 2314(1).

3 78. California’s implied warranty of merchantability statute also provides
4 that “[g]oods to be merchantable must be at least such as . . . (f) [c]onform to the
5 promises or affirmations of fact made on the container or label if any.” Cal. Com.
6 Code § 2314(2)(f).

7 79. Sprouts is a merchant with respect to the sale of the Class Products.
8 Therefore, a warranty of merchantability is implied in every contract for sale of the
9 Class Products to California consumers.

10 80. By advertising the Class Products with its current packaging, Sprouts
11 made an implied promise that the Class Products are pure avocado oil. The Class
12 Products do not, however, “conform to the promises...made on the container or
13 label” because they are not pure avocado oil. Plaintiff, as well as consumers, did not
14 receive the goods as impliedly warranted by Sprouts to be merchantable.

15 81. Therefore, the Class Products are not merchantable under California law
16 and Sprouts has breached its implied warranty of merchantability with respect to the
17 Class Products.

18 82. If Plaintiff and members of the Classes had known that the Class
19 Products were not pure avocado oil, they would not have been willing to pay the
20 premium price associated with them, or would not have purchased them at all.
21 Therefore, as a direct and/or indirect result of Sprouts’ breach, Plaintiff and members
22 of the Classes have suffered injury and deserve to recover all damages afforded under
23 the law.

24 83. Within a reasonable amount of time after Plaintiff discovered that Sprouts
25 did in fact breach the implied warranty, Plaintiff notified Sprouts of the breach.
26
27
28

1 losses and other general and specific damages, including but no limited to the amounts
2 paid for the Class Products, and any interest that would have accrued on those monies,
3 all in amount to be proven at trial.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the proposed Classes,
6 respectfully prays for following relief:

7 A. Certification of this case as a class action on behalf of the Classes defined
8 above, appointment of Plaintiff as Class representative, and appointment of his counsel
9 as Class counsel;

10 B. A declaration that Sprouts' actions, as described herein, violate the laws
11 described herein;

12 C. An award to Plaintiff and the proposed Classes of restitution and/or other
13 equitable relief, including, without limitation, restitutionary disgorgement of all profits
14 and unjust enrichment that Sprouts obtained from Plaintiff and the proposed Classes
15 as a result of its unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business practices described herein;

16 D. An award of injunctive and other equitable relief as is necessary to protect
17 the interests of Plaintiff and the Class members, including, *inter alia*, an order
18 prohibiting Sprouts from engaging in the unlawful acts described above;

19 E. An award of all economic, monetary, actual, consequential, and
20 compensatory damages caused by Sprouts' conduct;

21 F. An award of punitive damages;

22 G. An award of nominal damages;

23 H An award to Plaintiff and his counsel of reasonable expenses and
24 attorneys' fees;

25 I. An award to Plaintiff and the proposed Classes of pre and post-judgment
26 interest, to the extent allowable; and

27 J. For such further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.
28

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the proposed Classes, hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable of right by jury.

Dated this 30th day of September, 2024.

DON BIVENS, PLLC

By: s/ Teresita T. Mercado
Don Bivens
Teresita T. Mercado
15169 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 205
Scottsdale, Arizona 85254

SMITH KRIVOSHEY, PC

Joel D. Smith (*pro hac vice* to be filed)
867 Boylston Street, 5th Floor, Ste. 1520
Boston, MA 02116
Phone: 617-377-7404
E-Mail: joel@skclassactions.com

SMITH KRIVOSHEY, PC

Yeremey O. Krivoshey (*pro hac vice* to be filed)
166 Geary Street, Ste. 1500-1507
San Francisco, CA 94108
Phone: 415-839-7000
E-Mail: yeremey@skclassactions.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CLRA Venue Declaration Pursuant to California Civil Code Section 1780(d)

I, Teresita T. Mercado, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice in the State of Arizona and a member of the bar of this Court. I am an attorney at Don Bivens PLLC, counsel of record for Plaintiff in this action. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and, if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify thereto under oath.

2. The Complaint filed in this action is filed in the proper place for trial under Civil Code Section 1780(d) because Defendant's principal place of business is in Maricopa County, which is in this District. It is also proper for the additional reason that Defendant does business in Maricopa County, which is in this District.

Pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct/

Executed on this 30th day of September, 2024.

s/ Teresita T. Mercado

Teresita T. Mercado